

REMARKS

Applicant has cancelled claims 1-9, and added new claims 10-21 in lieu thereof.

As best understood, claims 10-21 stand rejected as allegedly being obvious over some combination of Nation, Vaughn, Rodriquez and Dolan. However, as far as none of the references disclosed an elongated jaw having an elongated notch to engage a distally aligned first locknut protrusion and a second jaw having a non-elongated notch for engaging a less distally disposed second protrusion, the references alone or in combination fail to disclose that which is claimed in new independent claim 10. Indeed, none of the references disclose pliers jaws having differently configured notches specifically sized for engaging different distally disposed locknut protrusions.

The present invention relates to and specifically claims a pliers for and with a locknut (e.g. claims 1 and 13), and particularly an electrical junction locknut (e.g. claims 14-17). The relied on prior art is unrelated to and teaches away from the presently claimed construction.

Nation, a principal reference, discloses a "wrench" to grip cylindrical or hexagonal objects (lines 1-8). The inverted V-shaped notch of angle 11, and the serrated jaw face are unrelated to and particularly ill suited for loosening an electrical junction box locknut.

Dolan, another principal reference, relates to self -opening pliers. While several jaws constructions are shown, none relate to any of the presently claimed

aspects. Further, none of the Dolan jaws appear to be operable for loosening or tightening an electrical junction box locknut.

Vaughn discloses a trimming tool “for cleaning the surface of storage battery terminals” and is likewise far removed from the present invention.

Rodriquez discloses a pliers for securing housing and is likewise unrelated to and inoperable for loosening or tightening an electrical junction box locknut.

Schmidt discloses an “electrician’s wrench” not a pliers. The Schmidt wrench, of course, has no opposed jaws, and no jaws edged for engaging different distally disposed protrusion. The Schmidt wrench simultaneously engages all the transversely disposed equally distally disposed protrusion. The rejection suggests that Schmidt contemplates a pliers. However, Schmidt teaches away from a pliers, at par. 0032, wherein Schmidt states that “It is often difficult to position a pliers or other tool so as to engage the lugs [30] of a locknut [24] sufficiently to tighten or loosen the locknut [24]”. Schmidt teaches away from the invention in these several respects.

Castner, Sr. et al. disclose “wrench” not a pliers. In Castner, Sr. et al. there are no opposed pivotally disposed jaws. The parallel fixedly opposed surfaces 36 are inoperable for engaging the protrusion on a locknut.

Insofar as none of the references disclose a pliers useful or operable for engaging the protrusion on a locknut, the references taken alone or in combination, are fatally deficient to the limitations of the claims.

Insofar as none of the references disclose pivotably disposed jaws for engaging different distally disposed protrusions of a locknut, combining the references cannot imply that which is not in each reference.

Insofar as the principal references are directed to wrenches and are unrelated or teach away from pliers jaws construction, the alleged combination is pregnant with hindsight.

The claims, as amended, clearly distinguish over the art taken alone or even in a hindsight construction.

The applicant respectfully request a one-month extension of time to July 22, 2005 in which to respond to the official action and enclose a check in the amount of \$60.00 to cover the required fee. If additional fees are required or a credit is forthcoming, than these fees may be charged or credited to the undersigned Attorney's Deposit Account 10-0100.

An early allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

LACKENBACH SIEGEL, LLP


Marvin Feldman, Reg. 25,797

MF:k

Date July 11, 2005

One Chase Road

Scarsdale, NY 10583